

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

RONALD TERELL STOCKTON, : Civil No. 1:22-CV-00114

Petitioner, :

v. :

SECRETARY OF THE
PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS, *et al.*, :

Respondents. : Judge Jennifer P. Wilson

ORDER

Before the court is the report and recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Martin C. Carlson recommending that the petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 be dismissed as untimely because the petition was filed far outside the statute of limitations and there are no applicable grounds for equitable tolling. (Doc. 32.) In response, Petitioner filed general objections to the report and recommendation rearguing the points of his petition and generally disagreeing with Judge Carlson's analysis. (Doc. 34.)

When a party raises only general objections to a report and recommendation, a district court is not required to conduct a de novo review of the report and recommendation. *Goney v. Clark*, 749 F.2d 5, 6–7 (3d Cir. 1984). “To obtain de novo determination of a magistrate’s findings by a district court, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) requires both timely and specific objections to the report.” *Id.* at 6.

Thus, when reviewing general objections to a report and recommendation, the court's review is limited "to ascertaining whether there is 'clear error' or 'manifest injustice'" on the face of the record. *Boomer v. Lewis*, No. 3:06-CV-00850, 2009 WL 2900778, at *1 (M.D. Pa. Sept. 9, 2009).

The court has reviewed Judge Carlson's report and recommendation and finds no clear error or manifest injustice on the face of the record. Petitioner's objections merely express disagreement with Judge Carlson's analysis and attempt to rehash or restate arguments already considered and rejected by Judge Carlson in the thorough report and recommendation. (*See* Doc. 32.) Accordingly, **IT IS**

ORDERED THAT:

1. The report and recommendation issued by United States Magistrate Judge Martin C. Carlson, Doc. 32, is **ADOPTED** in its entirety.
2. Petitioner's objections, Doc. 34, are **OVERRULED**.¹
3. The petition, Doc. 1, is **DENIED WITH PREJUDICE**.
4. The court finds no basis to issue a certificate of appealability because Petitioner has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c).
5. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case.

s/Jennifer P. Wilson

JENNIFER P. WILSON
United States District Court Judge
Middle District of Pennsylvania

Dated: July 25, 2022

¹ Petitioner filed numerous additional motions and affidavits following the issuance of the report and recommendation. (Docs. 33, 35–39.) Because the court adopts the report and recommendation and denies the petition with prejudice, Petitioner's filings are moot.